

From: A Supporter of COOL [<mailto:letters@californiamarinereserves.org>]
Sent: Monday, March 13, 2006 11:43 PM
To: MLPAComments@resources.ca.gov
Subject: MLPAComments: Fwd: I Support Package 2!

>Date: Mon, 13 Mar 2006 09:41:50 -0800
>To: letters@californiamarinereserves.org
>Subject: I Support Package 2!
>From: "Sally A. Smith" <sally@paradisesurf.com>

>
>3/13/06

>
>Chairman Phil Isenberg
>MLPA Task Force
>c/o Resources Agency
>1416 Ninth Street, Suite 1311
>Sacramento, CA 95814

>
>via E-Mail

>
>Dear Chairman Isenberg:

>
>I am a business owner, homeowner, and avid surfer, sailor, and beach
>walker. I have for many years participated in activities that protect
>and enhance the national treasure we call the Monterey Bay National
>Marine Sanctuary - from beach clean-ups and water testing to sitting on
>the MBNMS Advisory Council.

>
>While I appreciate very much the hard work your staff has done in
>putting together the alternative Package S, it does not do enough to
>support the intent of the MLPA.

>
>It is imperative that any new amendments to the MLPA be strong and
>proactive in protecting, preserving, and enhancing the MBNMS for future
>generations.

>
>That is why I support Package 2 as the most effective network proposal
>under your consideration. It is more balanced for conservation and for
>socio-economic impact than Package S.

>
>The problems with Package S are:

>
>1. It builds its network on reserves near the minimum size acceptable
>to the Science Advisory Team. This risks the effectiveness of the
>network.

>
>2. Package S does a poor job of obtaining socio-economic benefits we
>could derive from MLPA: it puts weak protections at areas popular for
>non-consumptive recreation like diving, and does little to enhance the
>"destination value" of the Monterey area for eco-tourism. Monterey and
>Pacific Grove must have more reserves and high-protection areas than
>Package S offers. The Carmel Pinnacles Reserve must be large enough to
>cover the spots of greatest value to Monterey's commercial dive boat
>fleet.

>
>3. Package S places weak protection in deeper offshore waters, risking
>food sources for sea birds, marine mammals and larger fish.

>
>4. Package S would actually create more negative impact on the squid
>and spot prawn fisheries than the more effective and better balanced
>Package 2.

>
>For these reasons, I emphatically urge you to choose Package 2 as the
>best protection for our Sanctuary and the health of our amazing ocean
>environment.
>
>
>Sincerely,
>
>Sally A. Smith
>3961 Portola Drive
>Santa Cruz, CA 95062
>
>
>CC: Governor Arnold Schwarzenegger
>State Capitol Bldg.
>Sacramento, CA 95814
>The Coalition of Organizations for Ocean Life (COOL)
> letters@californiamarinereserves.org